

# SENATOR TALIAFERRO vs. GOVERNOR JENNINGS

The Senator Evades No Question—His Rejoinder is Complete and Overwhelming—He Cast No Such Votes as Governor Jennings Charges—Voted Strictly With His Party Associates on Every Financial Measure—For Bureau of Labor Obeyed Request of Labor Unions of the Country.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 26, 1904.—Hon. W. S. Jennings, Tallahassee, Fla.: My Dear Sir—Your letter of January 1, postmarked the 4th, reached me in Jacksonville January 5. I would have replied at once, but was prevented by an unusual pressure of public business, attention to which I regard as of more importance than writing political letters. I avail myself of the opportunity now, however, and take occasion to give you some information about my record, which you seem so sadly to need, and which will serve, I hope, to correct the astounding statements you boast of having made in your recent public speeches.

I take up your letter in the order of its statements. In making the statement I did, viz., "Governor Jennings says I have done nothing since I have been in Congress," there was no intention to do you injustice. Several gentlemen of unquestioned integrity and veracity informed me both before and after the publication of the Ocala Banner letter, that you had said as much to them, and I will give you their names, should you desire it. While you disclaim ever having used that language, its substance or equivalent, your letter, to my mind, is in itself the equivalent of that language.

You devote much space to the Florida Indian war claim. It is a simple matter, and a plethora of words and phrases will not mislead the public. The claim had been standing for over forty years. The people of Florida know this, and they know, too, when and by whom the provision for its payment was finally passed through Congress. I have never claimed the credit for myself, nor denied to others the credit due them. You cannot go further than I in commending the earnest and intelligent efforts of Senator Pasco and other members of both branches of Congress who preceded me here. I have stated repeatedly that, on entering Congress in 1896, I found in the Senate files, as a result of their painstaking work, much valuable data which contributed no little to the passage of the measure, and, indeed, for my part, I even accorded to you credit for the perfunctory part you played in taking the warrant home.

## Some Pertinent Questions.

Are you taking especial pride in the fact that the Indian war claim was collected during your administration? And are you offering that to the people of Florida as something with which you are especially to be credited? Do you forget, or did you know, that Governor Drew and Governor Robinson, and also the late Governor Perry, Governor Fleming, and Governor Mitchell all exercised the greatest energy in urging this matter upon Congress, each in his day, and that all of them, perhaps, made greater effort in this direction than any have been known to do since? Do you realize that if the claim were not collected during either of the administrations I have named it was not the fault of those distinguished and much-loved sons of Florida, and that the final collection of the claim reflects no more credit upon you than upon them? In connection with this Indian war claim, why is it that you seek to have me say that the aggregate of the various appropriations for Florida, viz., about \$4,100,000, would lower the taxes and lessen the burden of all the people? You must know that I confined my speech to the amount appropriated for the Indian war claim, viz., and to be exact, \$1,073,930.66. The language of my letter, read in yours, is plain and unmistakable. I mentioned that the total appropriations obtained for Florida were about \$4,100,000, and then said:

"This means more than \$7 per capita for every man, woman and child in the State of Florida, and the collection of the Indian war claim, provided the affairs of the state are administered wisely and justly, should have the effect of lowering taxes and lessening the burdens of all the people."

I reiterate now that every dollar of the Indian War claim—\$1,073,930.66—should have the effect of lowering taxes and lessening the burdens of all the people; and I did not say so then. I do say now that every dollar of the total of appropriations for Florida does its part in lessening the burdens of all the people.

Do you contend that the improvement of rivers and harbors does not make any and competing rates of freight?

Do you contend that high rates of freight are not a burden on all the people?

Do you contend that the money spent either in improvement of the kind or upon public buildings does not add to the prosperity of workmen, artisans and contractors, does not find its way into all avenues of trade and does not lessen the burdens of all as well as add to the prosperity of all?

Do you contend that the eight dollars a month in pensions for the brave soldiers of the Seminole Indian war of 1856-58, who risked their lives in the common defense, and the aged and oftentimes destitute widows of the soldiers of that war, is not a solace and a comfort to them in their old age and a lessening of their burdens?

## Surge Indeed.

If you do your position is strange indeed, so strange that I venture there are but few, if any, in Florida who will agree with you. But I will admit that your contention generally on this position is in entire harmony with your most unbecomingly untrue account of the Indian War claim only.

\$20,822 is applicable to lowering the taxes and lessening the burdens of all the people. You say that by Legislative action upon your recommendation, this was applied to the State's bonded debt. Do you mean to say that if there had been no recommendation and no Legislative action the State would not have been better off to the extent of the sum collected? But tell me, please, what became of the difference between that sum you mention and the \$1,073,930.66? Was it paid to the people of Florida, either in money or by settlement of the State's bonded indebtedness to the Government and the accrued interest thereon? And, if so paid, does not that lessen the burdens and lower the taxes of all the people?

The State owed the national Government \$20,822. By act of Congress, approved March 3, 1896 (before my election to the Senate), the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized and directed to proceed for the collection of State bonds owned by the Government, wherever there was default on the part of such State in the payment of interest. Under this act the Attorney-General threatened suit. The claim of the Government was a claim in law and equity and payment could have been enforced. On the other hand the claim of the State was one in equity only, and its payment was dependent upon the justice of Congress. This suit would probably have been brought had it not been for the provision incorporated in an act of Congress at the instance and largely through the efforts of the Florida delegation. The provision stayed the suit. Suppose these proceedings had not been stayed?

receiving \$682,946 in cash, Florida, without imposing any tax upon the circulation of State Banks or State banking associations, and the same are hereby repealed."

## Couldn't Have Done Less.

You contend that, in addition to the payment of the Indian War claim proper, the Government had a demand for adjustment of the mutual account between the State and the United States, the payment by the latter of \$88,362.11, due the school fund of the State; \$25,007.02 due the trustees of the internal improvement fund; \$5,326.21 due the general revenue fund; and Florida on general census account, and further succeeded in collecting for the State the additional sum of \$13,248. Of course you did if you use the word "procured" as meaning "received." The act for a settlement of the mutual account, and that of the bonds of the State, held in the Indian trust fund, should be surrendered to the Governor of Florida. You would have been derelict in your duty if you had failed to receive the money; but, even in that event, the Governor, under the law, would have found a way to settle the account and the State would have suffered no loss. I repeat, therefore, that you could not very well have done less.

Every one of the sums you mention in connection with this claim had been withheld from the State, because, as have said before, the State had failed to pay the interest on its bonds, and the Government withheld payment on all of them to indemnify itself against loss. The act of Congress, providing for the settlement of the account, and this alone, unlocked the doors of the United States Treasury for the payment to the State of every dollar due to whatever account or fund. Referring again to the \$132,000 of bonds and the \$248,946 interest thereon due the Government, you do not seem to me to be lessening in any way the burdens and lowering taxes. I maintain that a debt, wherever owed, is a burden, and that its payment, whether to one creditor or another, lessens that burden in the sum of the debt paid.

## Not Here for Buncombe.

As to your suggestion that I have not introduced a bill, resolution or amendment on any subject, or embodying any principle in the Democratic platform, you know that since I have been in Congress the Administration of Republican and Democratic branches of Congress overwhelmingly so, and I am not here for buncombe or to whistle against the wind, but to devote my time and best thought and energy to passing measures of benefit to the people of Florida. Practically every proposition contained in the Democratic platform, I have introduced in the Senate, in one way or another, since I have been a member, and upon every one of them, your statement to the contrary notwithstanding, I have voted in full and strict accord with the platform of the Democratic party. I do not pretend to be bold enough to claim leadership in the exclusion of Democratic Senators who have grown gray in the service of party and country. I have been content, on the contrary, and regard it as being to the interests of Florida as well, to listen to their wise counsel and to follow rather than to presume to lead. Perhaps, if I had been engaged in the legislature with the sound of my own voice, or were given to the peripatetic practice of useless speechmaking, I might have introduced such bills, even though they had been already before the body and were foredoomed to die in the pigeon-holes of Republican committees.

## The Delegation a Unit.

You say that I have not gotten an appropriation for any place or point west of the St. Johns river. By your reading of the record, what have I gotten east of that river? I say that the work of the delegation is the work of a unit and is not bounded by nor circumscribed in geographic line or limits. I say that I assisted in getting every appropriation west of the St. Johns river, just as my colleagues assisted in getting every appropriation east of that river. It is true, you add, that you are not dealing with what has been done by the Florida delegation—delegation, but let me tell you that the record of the delegation is one and inseparable. If your system of reasoning be sound, then each of us has done nothing, and how is it possible that all of us have done anything? I will remind you again that I have never claimed any results whatsoever not associated with the work of my colleagues, and you cannot credit the whole delegation with the accomplishment of anything without giving due credit to each member for his proportionate part thereof.

No member of the delegation has ever complained that each and every member has failed to do his part in any matter relating to the interests of the people of Florida, but, on the other hand, we have all realized with great satisfaction that we have worked in full accord and harmony in obtaining results. No member of the delegation, who has labored with me here or rather with whom I have labored, will sustain you in your assertion that I have not done my full share. But why, therefore, should you complain? Your reference to my interest in the First National Bank of Tampa would seem to have no proper place in this discussion, and yet, let me assure you, there is nothing whatever about it to be ashamed of or to conceal. The United States statute provides for the establishment and regulation of national banks and authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to designate depositories for Government money. Years before I came to the Senate the First National Bank of Tampa was designated one of these depositories, because it was located at a point where the Government was collecting and disbursing large sums of money and it was as much for the convenience of the Government as for the bank. Since I have been in the Senate the deposits have been increased, just as they have been increased, as I understand, all over the country. This was no privilege accorded the bank because of my connection with it, nor was it any special source of profit, for there has never been a time in the history of the bank since it has been a depository that it has not had more idle money than the total amount of the Government deposits.

You think that my sense of justice or conscientious regard for duty would be warped by a connection with a national bank, can easily disabuse your mind of that idea by turning to Congressional Record, Vol. 33, page 1833, where you will find my vote plainly recorded in favor of abolishing the tax on State banks. (See amendment that follows.)

## Voted to Abolish State Bank Tax.

"Section 9. That sections 3412 and 3413 of the Code of Laws of the State of Florida, and all other acts and parts of acts which impose any tax upon the circulation of State Banks or State banking associations, be, and the same are hereby repealed."

Democrats for the amendment offered by Senator Jones. The yeas voted were as follows: Yeas—Bate, Berry, Butler, Chilton, Clark (Mont.), Clay, Cockrell, Culberson, Daniel, Harris, Jones (Ark.), Jones (Nev.), Kenny, McEnery, McLaurin, Martin, Money, Morgan, Pettus, Rawlins, Stewart, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Tillman, Turley, Vest. Senator Mallory was absent on account of illness, but paired to vote yeas on the proposition.

## No Such Vote.

You say that I voted against an amendment to grade national banks according to population, and cite Congressional Record, Vol. 33, page 2390, as your authority. Page 2390 is a reference to the subject, but deals entirely with proceedings of the House of Representatives. I do find, however, in an entirely different place in the Record that Senator Nelson offered the following amendment to the financial, or gold standard bill: "Sec. 10. That section 5128 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Section 5128. No association shall be organized with a less capital than \$100,000 except that banks with a capital of not less than \$50,000 may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be organized in any place the population of which does not exceed 6,000 inhabitants, and especially that banks with a capital of not less than \$25,000 may, with the sanction of the Secretary of the Treasury, be organized in any place the population of which does not exceed 1,000 inhabitants. No association shall be organized in a city the population of which exceeds 50,000 persons with a capital of less than \$200,000.'"

## Never So Voted.

I say that you have absolutely misrepresented me, unwittingly I hope, before the people whom you have addressed. I assert that I never so voted, and that the Congressional Record, Vol. 33, page 1823, the same you cite, shows that your statement has no foundation in fact. This page shows also that I voted strictly with my party, as I have always done on every question at issue. The facts in the case are these: Senator Stewart of Nevada offered the following amendments:

"In section 6, on page 15, line 5, after the word 'interest' it is proposed to strike out 'in gold coin of the present standard value' and insert 'in coin of the standard value of the act of July 4, 1870.'"

Senator Aldrich moved to lay this amendment on the table and the may votes on the proposition to table were as follows (see Congressional Record, Vol. 33, page 1829, the same you cite):

"Yeas—Bate, Berry, Butler, Chilton, Clark (Mont.), Clay, Cockrell, Culberson, Daniel, Harris, Jones (Ark.), Jones (Nev.), Kenny, McEnery, McLaurin, Martin, Money, Morgan, Pettus, Rawlins, Stewart, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Tillman, Turley, Senator Mallory, being ill and absent, was paired to vote nay on the proposition."

You understand, or ought to, that this record against tabling the amendment was equivalent to a vote for the amendment. Would you have voted differently?

## With the Democrats Always.

I cite the Congressional Record in further proof of my position on the financial or gold standard bill: Vol. 33, page 1822. Senator Teller of Colorado introduced the following amendment to the pending bill:

"The people of the United States are in favor of bimetalism, and desirous of an international agreement with the great commercial nations of the world that will secure the use of both gold and silver as such an article of commerce, and will maintain the parity between gold and silver coin, and the efforts of the Government are hereby pledged to endeavor to secure such international agreement as speedily as possible."

The vote on this was (Congressional Record, volume 33, page 1829, yes), as follows: Bate, Berry, Butler, Chandler, Chilton, Clark (Mont.), Clay, Culberson, Daniel, Harris, Heitfeld, Jones (Ark.), Jones (Nev.), Kenny, McEnery, McLaurin, Martin, Money, Morgan, Pettus, Rawlins, Stewart, Taliaferro, Teller, Turley, Tillman, Vest. Senator Mallory was absent on account of illness, but paired to vote yeas.

Following this Senator Pettus of Alabama offered this amendment (Congressional Record, volume 33, page 1829):

"Gold coins and silver dollars coined by the United States shall be a legal tender in all payments at their nominal values when not below the weight and limit of tolerance provided by law for the single gold standard and tolerance shall be a legal tender at valuation in proportion to their actual weight."

Senator Aldrich moved to lay this amendment on the table, but withdrew the motion, so that there was no direct vote. This was recorded in the following pages of the Record, viz., 1830, and my vote (with that of the other Democrats, was yeas, following is the vote in detail: Yeas—Bate, Berry, Butler, Chilton, Clark (Mont.), Clay, Cockrell, Culberson, Daniel, Harris, Jones (Ark.), Jones (Nev.), Kenny, McEnery, McLaurin, Martin, Money, Morgan, Pettus, Rawlins, Stewart, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Tillman, Turley, Vest. Senator Mallory was absent and ill, but paired to vote yeas."

## A Test Proposition.

Senator Pettus immediately offered another amendment, as follows: "That no coin or tender of this act shall be held or construed to affect the present legal tender quality of silver dollars coined by the United States."

The yeas voted on this test proposition were as follows (Congressional Record, Vol. 33, page 1830): Yeas—Bate, Berry, Butler, Chilton, Clark (Mont.), Clay, Culberson, Daniel, Harris, Jones (Nev.), Kenny, McEnery, McLaurin, Martin, Money, Morgan, Pettus, Rawlins, Stewart, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Tillman, Turley, Vest. Senator Mallory was absent on account of illness, but paired to vote yeas on the proposition.

Senator McLaurin offered the following amendment to the same bill (Congressional Record, volume 33, page 1832):

"Section 9. That sections 3412 and 3413 of the Code of Laws of the State of Florida, and all other acts and parts of acts which impose any tax upon the circulation of State banks or State banking associations, be, and the same are hereby repealed."

The vote thereon is recorded on page 1833, volume 33, Congressional Record, and those voting yeas were the following: Berry, Chilton, Clark (Mont.), Clay, Culberson, Daniel, Harris, Jones (Ark.), Jones (Nev.), McEnery, McLaurin, Martin, Money, Morgan, Pettus, Rawlins, Stewart, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Tillman, Turley, Vest. Senator Mallory was absent on account of illness, but was paired to vote yeas.

Senator Jones of Arkansas (chairman of the national Democratic executive committee) offered the following amendment to the same bill, viz., the gold standard bill (Congressional Record, volume 33, page 1833):

"That from and after the passage of this act the mints of the United States shall be open to the coinage of silver, and there shall be coined dollars of the weight of 412.5 grains, Troy, of standard silver, nine-tenths fine, as provided by the act of January 18, 1837, and upon the same terms and subject to the limitations and provisions of law regulating the coinage and legal tender quality of gold; and wherever the said coins herein provided for shall be received into the Treasury or any other place provided therefor in the manner now provided by law."

Senator Jones. The yeas voted were as follows: Yeas—Bate, Berry, Butler, Chilton, Clark (Mont.), Clay, Cockrell, Culberson, Daniel, Harris, Jones (Ark.), Jones (Nev.), Kenny, McEnery, McLaurin, Martin, Money, Morgan, Pettus, Rawlins, Stewart, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Tillman, Turley, Vest. Senator Mallory was absent on account of illness, but paired to vote yeas on the proposition.

## No Such Vote.

You say that I voted against an amendment to grade national banks according to population, and cite Congressional Record, Vol. 33, page 2390, as your authority. Page 2390 is a reference to the subject, but deals entirely with proceedings of the House of Representatives. I do find, however, in an entirely different place in the Record that Senator Nelson offered the following amendment to the financial, or gold standard bill: "Sec. 10. That section 5128 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Section 5128. No association shall be organized with a less capital than \$100,000 except that banks with a capital of not less than \$50,000 may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be organized in any place the population of which does not exceed 6,000 inhabitants, and especially that banks with a capital of not less than \$25,000 may, with the sanction of the Secretary of the Treasury, be organized in any place the population of which does not exceed 1,000 inhabitants. No association shall be organized in a city the population of which exceeds 50,000 persons with a capital of less than \$200,000.'"

## Never So Voted.

I say that you have absolutely misrepresented me, unwittingly I hope, before the people whom you have addressed. I assert that I never so voted, and that the Congressional Record, Vol. 33, page 1823, the same you cite, shows that your statement has no foundation in fact. This page shows also that I voted strictly with my party, as I have always done on every question at issue. The facts in the case are these: Senator Stewart of Nevada offered the following amendments:

"In section 6, on page 15, line 5, after the word 'interest' it is proposed to strike out 'in gold coin of the present standard value' and insert 'in coin of the standard value of the act of July 4, 1870.'"

Senator Aldrich moved to lay this amendment on the table and the may votes on the proposition to table were as follows (see Congressional Record, Vol. 33, page 1829, the same you cite):

"Yeas—Bate, Berry, Butler, Chilton, Clark (Mont.), Clay, Cockrell, Culberson, Daniel, Harris, Heitfeld, Jones (Ark.), Jones (Nev.), Kenny, McEnery, McLaurin, Martin, Money, Morgan, Pettus, Rawlins, Stewart, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Tillman, Turley, Senator Mallory, being ill and absent, was paired to vote nay on the proposition."

You understand, or ought to, that this record against tabling the amendment was equivalent to a vote for the amendment. Would you have voted differently?

## With the Democrats Always.

I cite the Congressional Record in further proof of my position on the financial or gold standard bill: Vol. 33, page 1822. Senator Teller of Colorado introduced the following amendment to the pending bill:

"The people of the United States are in favor of bimetalism, and desirous of an international agreement with the great commercial nations of the world that will secure the use of both gold and silver as such an article of commerce, and will maintain the parity between gold and silver coin, and the efforts of the Government are hereby pledged to endeavor to secure such international agreement as speedily as possible."

The vote on this was (Congressional Record, volume 33, page 1829, yes), as follows: Bate, Berry, Butler, Chandler, Chilton, Clark (Mont.), Clay, Culberson, Daniel, Harris, Heitfeld, Jones (Ark.), Jones (Nev.), Kenny, McEnery, McLaurin, Martin, Money, Morgan, Pettus, Rawlins, Stewart, Taliaferro, Teller, Turley, Tillman, Vest. Senator Mallory was absent on account of illness, but paired to vote yeas.

## Would Yours Have Been Different?

You have proclaimed that my votes on one of these propositions were wholly wrong. Would yours have been different? Would you have been recorded in the gold standard column?

Referring to the Congressional Record (Vol. 33, page 1651), you say:

"That the platform seeking to uplift the condition of the American working man, for the creation of a Department of Labor in charge of a Secretary with a seat in the Cabinet, while you, when the bill was under consideration, voted for an amendment to strike from the title the words 'labor and,' thus disregarding the words 'labor and,' and especially the interests of the laboring people of Florida."

## Misquotes The Record Twice.

You have here misquoted the Record twice. A bill to create a Department of Labor and Commerce was not then under consideration. The bill under consideration was a bill to create the department of commerce. The words "labor and" did not appear in its title, and hence there could properly be no motion to strike from the title words that were not in it. The motion was to strike from the body of the bill the words "the department of labor and."

It was made by Senator Pettus in connection with the clearly expressed wishes of officials of great and representative labor organizations, and for this motion I cast my vote yeas—Congressional Record, Vol. 33, page 1651.

The words in the body of the bill in this connection were Department of Labor and the office of Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, and all that pertains to the same be and the same hereby are, placed under the jurisdiction and made a part of the Department of Commerce."

The labor organizations were opposed to having the Department of Labor placed in and under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce, and Senator Pettus's motion was to see that it would not be so subordinated. The Department of Labor, as it then existed, was a separate and independent department of the Government, and created, upon the requests of the great labor organizations of the country, which hoped eventually to see it equipped with what it still lacked, viz: The right for its Secretary to have a place in the President's cabinet under the date of January 20, 1892, and referring to the then status of the bill, filed this protest:

"The creation of the Department of Commerce, with the provision for the subordination of the Department of Labor, will minimize the importance of labor's interests and minimize the present department of labor. Against such a procedure, in the name of American labor, I enter my most solemn protest. . . . It is therefore urgently requested, that in the event that the honorable Senate should deem it wise to enact Senate Bill 569, that the Department of Labor, as so constituted, may be eliminated from its provisions."

Thus labor, having protested through Hon. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, and through Hon. H. R. Fuller, representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, the Order of Railway Conductors, the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, and the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, and through others who stood for the interests of labor against allowing the words referred to, to remain in the bill, thereby



Gold!  
Fille  
Silver!  
Nickel!

# WATCHES!

Fred G. B. Weihe, Ocala, Fla.



subordinating labor to the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce, Senator Pettus, on January 28, 1902 (Congressional Record, Vol. 33, page 1650), moved to strike from the body of the bill, NOT ITS TITLE, the words 'Department of Labor and.'

You will readily see, therefore, that the representatives of labor did not wish the Department of Labor carried into the Department of Commerce, and it must be quite as plain to you that, if the words "Department of Labor and" had been eliminated from the body of the bill, as contemplated by the amendment of Senator Pettus, the wishes of the representatives of labor would have been met and the Bureau of Labor allowed to remain in an independent state.

The yeas voted recorded on Senator Pettus's amendment was as follows (Congressional Record, Vol. 33, page 1651—the same you cite):

Yeas—Bacon, Bate, Berry, Blackburn, Clark (Montana), Cockrell, Dubois, Gibson, Harris, Hawley, Heitfeld, Jones (Arkansas), McLaurin (Mississippi), Mallory, Morgan, Pettus, Rawlins, Taliaferro, Tillman. You will see, therefore, that you have doubly misquoted the Record as well as misrepresented me.

## More Evidence Still.

If you need any further evidence as to the wishes of labor on this subject, you can turn to Congressional Record, Vol. 33, page 1601, where you will find Mr. Fuller's letter in full. I quote therefrom the following:

"I earnestly but respectfully protest on behalf of these organizations against that part of the pending bill (S. 569), which proposes to place the Department of Labor under the Department of Commerce. It is the hope of the laboring people of this country that an independent Department of Labor having a Cabinet officer as its official head may be created. This element of our citizenship, comprising as it does the great majority of our population, is certainly worthy of such recognition, and that too, by this Congress. This letter was dated January 22, 1902, or at the time the bill was pending in the condition referred to."

When the majority thus voted down the proposition to allow the Department of Labor to remain an independent department of the Government, the bill was amended by adding to its title the words "and labor," and adding to the body of the bill those words wherever the words "Department of Commerce" appeared. There was not a dissenting vote nor single objection to this amendment, and labor was thus given as much dignity and importance as possible in the new department of the Government. It will be seen, therefore, that, instead of voting against the interests of labor, as you say I did, I voted in accordance with labor's clearly expressed wishes, and endeavored as well to carry into effect the policy of the Democratic party.

## Let the People Judge.

I have gone at some length into these matters in order that the people of Florida may judge as to whether or not I have been true and loyal to the principles of the great Democratic party in which I have a vital interest. I have stated repeatedly that I stand before them upon my record. In their intelligence, in their sound judgment, in their correct sense of justice I have an abiding faith. I leave to them to judge as between you and me. I have accorded fair treatment to you and to all my opponents, and, while inviting the closest possible scrutiny into my record, I ask at least that that record be not misquoted, that my votes be not misstated, and that the record, all in all, from the beginning of my service in the Senate to the present day, be fairly read. My duties here render it impossible now for me to name dates and places for the discussion of political questions. I hope, however, to be in Florida in a few days, and you will find me ready and willing and prepared to defend my record whenever, wherever, however, and by whomsoever assailed. Respectfully yours,

J. P. TALIAFERRO.

## THE SAGE OF MARTEL.

Gives Advice to Fellow-Democrats—The Pepper Box Should Not Pre-vail Against Sound Reason.

Editor of the Banner: In the premature and heated campaign for Senatorial honors that was opened several months ago, I take it that all good citizens of Florida regretted that any should feel called upon to eject into this ill-timed campaign the pepper-box and mud-slinging instead of personal merit and qualifications. It seems to me to be bad taste and the manifestation of a conscious want of merit on the part of any candidate for any office to resort to such political tactics. Are we not all, as members of the great democratic party, descendants from the same Caucasian race, and inheriting the blessings of self government, brethren, bound by the same common ties of brotherhood that was bequeathed to us by the blood of our forefathers in the Revolutionary war, that gained their independence, and has, as a result, placed us in line with the most powerful and progressive nations of the world? Would it not be in line with our material progress on all lines as wise, far-seeing statesmen, to not only grasp the great political issues of the

day and not only discuss those issues before the people, but with the sagacity of profound statesmen, as educators of the people, in anticipation of new issues that the present must necessarily develop, but to formulate public sentiment to meet and dispose of those issues when they come? I say yes, and I believe that the sovereign people of this state, at the primary to be held May 10, will rise in their might, and by their ballots relegate such disturbers of peace and good will to the rear.

As to the three candidates for Senatorial honors who first appeared upon the rostrum, I believe that either has sufficient ability, if their intellect was centered upon conservatism and profound statesmanship, to represent Florida with honor to himself and credit to his constituency.

There is but one Ben Tillman to use a "pitchfork" and hold his own and command a degree of respect among his fellow Senators. I am of opinion that in view of Florida's great need just at this time of the improvement of her rivers and harbors, and, last but not least, in securing national aid in the construction of improved roads, and the construction of a ship canal across the most eligible point of Florida, that it would not be good statesmanship to "swap horses while crossing the river," and place instead of tried and true representatives a pepper-box in the United States Senate, because, forsooth, his fiery venom might drive from our best and most efficient co-workers.

The history of Florida comes down to an unbroken democratic precedent in giving her representatives in Congress a second term. I do not claim that Senator Taliaferro is entitled to the credit solely of all that was done beneficially for Florida during his term in office. A Pasco, Dougherty, a Bullock and others did their best, did well, and under the same circumstances that Senator Taliaferro was surrounded, and the same unity of action that prevailed among our Congressmen, would doubtless have done as he did, succeeded. A Mallory, a Sparkman and a Davis stood shoulder to shoulder with him, and each is entitled to the hearty encomium of all the people, of "well done, good and faithful servants," and by their votes at the ensuing primary, say, "We reward merit, unity and success; return and continue to do as you have done."

H. W. Long.

## MR. MATHEW'S GOOD WORK.

The whole state of Florida is indebted to Mr. George G. Mathews for the good work he accomplished as proxy for General Bullock on the state executive committee at its recent session in Jacksonville.

Some of the members of the committee wanted an early primary, some a late primary, Mr. Mathews harmonized the opposing factions by proposing a compromise, and happily his wise and timely suggestion was accepted.

As a result, the primaries are called not too early and not too late and everybody seems satisfied.

The object of the primary is not to give one candidate an advantage over another candidate but the whole object is to give the voter an opportunity to pass judgment intelligently upon the fitness of the various candidates for the offices to which they aspire.

Along the same line it is unfortunate that Mr. Mathews did not insist on the committee fixing dates for the candidates to meet the voters, but perhaps, this part of the work will be delegated to the central committee and there will be no cause for complaint on the part of any one.

Things striven for should be justice and fairness and when done all is done.

There is no necessity for bitterness nor excitement. The candidates are all democrats and every voter should have the right freely and without criticism to express a preference.

Every voter has the right and should enjoy the right to express an opinion untrammelled from fear or apprehension of any kind.

If he is not accorded this right the theory that he is a sovereign is a fiction.

# THE FLORIDA FRUIT AND TRUCK GROWER.